IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

JASON MCLEAN and BRIAN COLEMAN,

Plaintiffs,

v.

COMMUNICATIONS CONSTRUCTION GROUP, LLC, BRAD DODSON, JONATHAN GATES AND MIKE FENDER

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 06-617 (JJF)

JURY TRIAL OF TWELVE DEMANDED

DEFENDANT COMMUNICATIONS CONSTRUCTION GROUP, LLC'S ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES TO PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT

Defendant Communications Construction Group, LLC (hereinafter "CCG") hereby files its Answer and Affirmative Defenses to the Plaintiffs' Complaint, in accordance with the paragraphs contained therein and states as follows:

THE PARTIES

1. The plaintiffs, Jason McLean and Brian Coleman (hereinafter referred to as "plaintiff Coleman" and "plaintiff McLean") were at all times relevant to this complaint, employees of Communications Construction Group, LLC.

Answer: Admitted.

2. The defendant Communications Construction Group, LLC (hereinafter referred to as "defendant CCG") is a limited liability company organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, whose agent for service of process is The Corporation Trust Company,

Corporation Trust Center, 1209 Orange Street, Wilmington, DE 19801. CCG is a subsidiary of

Dycom Industries, Inc. The Company serves hundreds of customers in 49 states, with a workforce of over 8,200 employees based in more than 200 locations. http://www.dycomind.com/subs/.

Answer: Denied as stated. CCG admits that it is a limited liability company organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware. CCG admits that its registered agent for service of process is The Corporation Trust Company, Corporation Trust Center, 1209 Orange Street, Wilmington, DE 19801. CCG admits that it is a separate and legally distinct subsidiary of Dycom Industries, Inc. CCG admits that it has operations in Pennsylvania, Delaware, New Jersey, and New York and currently has approximately 70 employees.

3. The defendant Mike Fender, hereinafter referred to as "defendant Fender" was at all times relevant to this complaint an employee and supervisor of CCG.

Answer: Denied as stated. Defendant admits that Mike Fender is an employee of CCG who had the title of "supervisor."

4. The defendant Bradley Dodson, hereinafter referred to as "defendant Dodson" was at all times relevant to this complaint an employee and supervisor of CCG.

Answer: Denied as stated. Defendant CCG admits that Brad Dodson was an employee of CCG who had the title of "foreman."

5. The defendant Jonathan Gates, hereinafter referred to as "defendant Gates" was at all times relevant to this complaint an employee.

Answer: Denied as stated. Defendant CCG admits that Jonathan Gates is an employee of CCG.

JURISDICTION

6. This Court has jurisdiction based upon the existence of a question arising under the laws of the United States of America and the State of Delaware. This action arises under Title VII, of the Civil Rights Act of 1954, 42 U.S.C: §2000e, et. seq., as amended by the Civil Rights Act of

1991, §704 of Title VII, and 42 U.S.C., §1983. Accordingly, this Court has jurisdiction over the controversy based upon the provisions of 42 U.S.C., §2000e-5(f)(3) as well as 28 U.S.C., §\$1331 and 1334. In addition, the actions arises under 42 U.S.C., §1981.

Answer: The allegations in this paragraph contain conclusions of law to which no responsive pleading is required.

VENUE

7. The unlawful employment practices alleged herein were committed within the State of Delaware. Accordingly, venue lies in the United States District Court for the District of Delaware under 42 U.S.C. §1339(b).

Answer: CCG denies that it has engaged in unlawful employment practices. The remaining allegations in this paragraph contain conclusions of law for which no responsive pleading is required.

EXHAUSTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES

8. Prior to the filing of this action, the plaintiffs timely filed a written charge of racial discrimination with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission - Philadelphia District Office and Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission on August 19, 2005 (a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit No, "1"), alleging the discriminatory conduct, which occurred beginning on May 31, 2005 and continued through plaintiffs' termination constituting a continuing course of conduct by the Defendant CCG.

Answer: Defendant CCG denies that they have engaged in a continuing course of discriminatory conduct. On information and belief, Defendant CCG admits that Plaintiff McLean filed a charge of racial discrimination on August 19, 2005 and that Plaintiff Coleman filed a charge of racial discrimination on September 10, 2005.

9. Thereafter, on June 29, 2006, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission issued to the plaintiffs a "Right to Sue Letter" which was received by plaintiff on or, about July 24, 2006 (a copy of that "Notice of Right to Sue Letter" is attached hereto as Exhibit "2").

Answer: Defendant CCG admits the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission issued a "Right to Sue Letter" dismissing Plaintiffs' charges of discrimination on June 29, 2006. Defendant CCG is without information sufficient to admit or deny the remaining allegations of this paragraph.

FACTS

10. Plaintiff Coleman began employment with the defendant on January 29, 2001 and was an operator and laborer of mainline pipe. Coleman was subsequently laid off and terminated.

Answer: Admitted.

11. Plaintiff McLean began employment with the defendant on January 29, 2001 and was an operator and laborer of mainline pipe. McLean eventually earned the position of foreman until being laid off and terminated.

Answer: Denied as stated. Defendant CCG admits that Plaintiff McLean began his employment with CCG on January 3, 2005. Defendant CCG admits Plaintiff McLean was given the title of foreman. Defendant CCG admits that Plaintiff McLean was laid off for lack of work and terminated.

12. On or around May 20, 2005 defendant Dodson stated to a group of white employees that, "At least you don't have to work with two dumb niggers!" referring to plaintiffs Coleman and McLean.

Answer: Denied.

13. At the time, Dodson was defendant's direct supervisor and brother of Dave Dodson, head of CCG's New Castle, Delaware worksite.

Answer: Denied as stated. Defendant CCG admits that Brad Dodson was the brother of Project Supervisor Dave Dodson.

14. One week later, on May 31, 2005, plaintiffs were informed of the slur by a coworker.

Answer: Denied as stated. Defendant CCG admits that Plaintiffs Coleman and McLean reported that they did not hear the alleged racial statement for themselves, but were informed of the statement by a coworker on May 31, 2005. Defendant CCG is without information as to whether Brad Dodson made such remarks.

15. Subsequently, Coleman and McLean asked Dodson if he made the remark.

Whereas, Dodson jumped off a machine and continually pointed his finger in McLean's face.

Answer: Denied as stated. Defendant CCG admits that Plaintiff Coleman and Plaintiff McLean confronted Brad Dodson about the remark. On information and belief, Defendant CCG further admits that the Coleman, McLean and Dodson engaged in a heated discussion.

16. Then Dodson started jabbing his finger against Coleman's chest to the point Coleman was moved backwards.

Answer: Denied as stated. Defendant CCG admits that Brad Dodson has acknowledged that he poked Plaintiff Coleman in the chest with his finger.

17. After the confrontation, Dodson called his brother Dave Dodson.

<u>Answer:</u> Defendant CCG is without information sufficient to admit or deny this paragraph.

18. Dave Dodson appointed Mike Fender to handle the situation.

Answer: Denied.

19. Fender's only solution to the problem was having everyone shake hands and go back to work.

Answer: Denied as stated. Defendant CCG admits that Mike Fender directed everyone to go back to work and reported the incident to human resources.

20. At that time, plaintiff McLean called Human Resources and plaintiff Coleman called the police.

Answer: Defendant CCG denies Plaintiff McLean called human resources. Defendant CCG admits that the police came to the worksite and questioned all the witnesses. Defendant CCG is without information sufficient to admit or deny the remaining allegations of this paragraph.

21. Employees Robert Cole and Joseph Tosh confirmed that Dodson made the racial slur about Defendant CCG. (5-31-05 Police Report attached as Exhibit "3").

Answer: Denied.

22. Defendant Dodson was charged with offensive touching.

Answer: Defendant CCG is without information sufficient to admit or deny this paragraph.

23. Directly after the incident, the plaintiffs were assigned low-level clean-up work.

Answer: Denied.

24. Plaintiffs were assigned to a new crew with Harry Ortiz, a Hispanic minority.

Answer: Denied.

25. The new crew became an instant success accumulating numbers ranging from \$400 to \$650.

Answer: Denied.

26. After only three days, plaintiffs and Ortiz were transferred to a site in West Chester, Pennsylvania.

Answer: Denied as stated. Defendant CCG admits that Plaintiffs Coleman and McLean were transferred to a job site in Philadelphia more than one month after the alleged racial incident because the job they were working on in Delaware was being cut by the customer.

27. The transfer resulted in a substantial reduction in salary.

Answer: Denied.

28. The plaintiffs made \$1.20 per square foot compared to \$2.80 per foot at the New Castle plant.

Answer: Denied.

29. In addition, the transfer added approximately two (2) hours in additional driving time for the plaintiffs.

Answer: Defendant CCG is without information sufficient to admit or deny this paragraph.

30. First, plaintiffs were given a truck to compensate for the additional driving.

Answer: Denied.

31. However, Jonathan Gates, upon learning about the truck, immediately took the truck away from the plaintiffs.

Answer: Denied as stated. Defendant CCG admits Plaintiff Coleman was told by Jonathan Gates that as per company policy he could not take the company truck home but he could continue to use it at work.

32. Plaintiffs Jonathan Gates and Mike Fender informed plaintiffs that they were the root of the problem because they complained to Human Resources prior to alerting them.

Answer: Denied.

33. Subsequently, the plaintiffs were laid off of work and ultimately terminated without warning.

Answer: Denied as stated. Defendant CCG admits that due to a loss of work, CCG laid off seven employees including Plaintiff Coleman and Plaintiff McLean.

34. Defendant Dodson never received any reprimand or consequence for his actions.

Answer: Denied.

COUNT I: RACIAL HARASSMENT DISCRIMINATION

35. Paragraphs 1-34 are hereby incorporated as if stated in full.

Answer: The responses set forth in paragraphs 1-34 of Defendant CCG' Answer to the Complaint are incorporated herein by reference as though they were fully set forth herein.

36. Defendant Dodson, a supervisor for defendant Defendant CCG, called Defendants niggers to a group of white employees.

Answer: Denied.

37. The actions by Defendant CCG constitute racial harassment and discrimination in violation of both Federal and State law.

Answer: Denied.

38. Plaintiffs' direct supervisor called them "niggers" because they were African American in front of a group of white employees.

Answer: Denied.

39. The statements were followed by the defendant assaulting the plaintiffs.

Answer: Denied.

40. After plaintiffs addressed the incident with their supervisors and human resources, they were subsequently "transferred" to lower paying jobs, laid off, and ultimately terminated without notice.

Answer: Denied.

COUNT II: RETALIATION

41. Paragraphs 1-40 are hereby incorporated as if stated in full.

Answer: The responses set forth in paragraphs 1-40 of Defendant CCG' Answer to the Complaint are incorporated herein by reference as though they were fully set forth herein.

42. The Defendant CCG' actions towards the plaintiffs were a result of their opposition to, and claims of employment discrimination, and as such were retaliatory in violation of 42 <u>U.S.C.</u> §2000e-3.

Answer: Denied.

43. The Defendant CCG intentionally, willfully, and wantonly retaliated against Plaintiffs in response to their complaints of racial harassment in violation of Federal and State law.

Answer: Denied.

COUNT III: EQUAL PROTECTION CLAUSE

Defendant CCG incorporates by reference herein its Motion for Partial Dismissal as to Count III. Accordingly, no response is required to Paragraphs 44 through 48.

COUNT IV: BREACH OF COVENANT OF GOOD FAITH AND FAIR DEALING IMPLIED

Defendant CCG incorporates by reference herein its Motion for Partial Dismissal as to Count IV. Accordingly, no response is required to Paragraphs 49 through 51.

COUNT V: ASSAULT AND BATTERY

Defendant CCG incorporates by reference herein its Motion for Partial Dismissal as to Count V. Accordingly, no response is required to Paragraphs 52 through 57.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

- 1. Plaintiffs' claims are barred in whole or in part by the applicable statute of limitations or filing periods.
- 2. Plaintiffs' claims are barred to the extent they failed to exhaust administrative remedies and/or prerequisites to bringing suit under the statutes cited in the Complaint.
- 3. Plaintiffs' claims are barred to the extent they failed to utilize company harassment policy reporting on complaint procedure.
- 4. Plaintiffs' claims for monetary relief are barred or diminished to the extent they failed to mitigate damages.
- 5. All actions taken with respect to Plaintiffs were taken in good faith and without discriminatory, harassing, or retaliatory motive.
- 6. Plaintiffs' Complaint must be dismissed to the extent it fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Michael P. Kelly

Michael P. Kelly
(DE Bar ID #2295)
McCarter & English LLP
Citizens Bank Building
919 N. Market Street, 18th Floor
Wilmington, DE 19801
302.984.6301
302.984.2493 (fax)
mkelly@mccarter.com

Thomas Benjamin Huggett Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP 1701 Market Street Philadelphia, PA 19103-2921 215.963.5191 215.963.5001 (fax) tbhuggett@morganlewis.com

Attorneys for Defendant Communications Construction Group, LLC

Dated: October 24, 2006

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the Defendant CCG's Answer to the

Complaint was served upon:

Ronald G. Poliquin Young, Malmberg & Howard, P.A. 30 The Green Dover, DE 19901 (302) 672-5600 Delaware Bar I.D. No. 4447

Attorney far Plaintiffs

this 24th day of October, 2006 via United States mail, postage prepaid.

/s/ Michael P. Kelly Michael P. Kelly (DE Bar ID #2295)

SJS 44 (Rev. 11/04)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

			······································	
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS Vasor MELean? Brian Coleman		DEFENDANTS Communical Brud Dodson	tions Constr InathanData	uction Iroup.
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Kent		County of Residence o	f First Listed Defendant	Vew Caste
(E)	(CEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)	(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)		
		LAND I	O CONDEMNATION CASES, US NVOLVED.	
(c) Attorney's (Fign Name, Address, and Telephone Number) ROXALA & Prliquis		Attorneys (If Known) A Carter 9 8	Michael P. Rei ngush U.P. G	lly (DE Bac 10# å 119 N. Market S 3, 1980 1
Do The Green Do	over, BG 19901			
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only) III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff (For Diversity Cases Only) and One Box for Defendant)				
U.S. Government Plaintiff	☐ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	P1	FF DEF 1 Incorporated or Pri of Business In This	incipal Place
2 U.S. Government	1 4 Diversity	Citizen of Another State	2	
Defendant	(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		of Business In A	
		Citizen or Subject of a Poreign Country	3 3 Foreign Nation	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT			L	OTHER STATUTES
CONTRACT	PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJUR	Y	BANKRUPTCY 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	☐ 400 State Reapportionment
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine	310 Airplane 362 Personal Injury	620 Other Food & Drug	☐ 423 Withdrawal	☐ 410 Antitrust
☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	315 Airplane Product Med. Malpraetice Liability 365 Personal Injury		28 USC 157	430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	☐ 320 Assault, Libel & Product Liability	☐ 630 Liquor Laws	PROPERTY RIGHTS	460 Deportation
& Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act	Slander 368 Asbestos Persona 309 Federal Employers' Injury Product	al G40 R.R. & Truck G 650 Airline Regs.	820 Copyrights 830 Patent	470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	Liability Liability	☐ 660 Occupational	☐ 840 Trademark	480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV
Student Loans (Excl. Veterans)	☐ 340 Marine PERSONAL PROPER ☐ 345 Marine Product ☐ 370 Other Fraud	TY Safety/Health 690 Other		☐ 810 Selective Service
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability	LABOR 710 Fair Labor Standards	SOCIAL SECURITY 861 HIA (1395ff)	☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange
of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits	350 Motor Vehicle 380 Other Personal Property Damage	Act	☐ 862 Black Lung (923)	☐ 875 Customer Challenge
☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	Product Liability 385 Property Damage 360 Other Personal Product Liability	2 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 730 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting	☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) ☐ 864 SSID Title XVI	12 USC 3410 890 Other Statutory Actions
☐ 196 Franchise	Injury	& Disclosure Act	□ 865 RSI (405(g))	☐ 891 Agricultural Acts
REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation	CIVIL RIGHTS PRISONER PETITIO 441 Voting 510 Motions to Vacat		FEDERAL TAX SUITS 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff	892 Economic Stabilization Act 893 Environmental Matters
220 Foreclosure	442 Employment Sentence	791 Empl. Ret. Inc.	or Defendant)	894 Energy Allocation Act
230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land	Accommodations Habeas Corpus:	Security Act	26 USC 7609	Sect Section 2 Act
245 Tort Product Liability	444 Welfare 535 Death Penalty 540 Mandamus & Ott	ha.		900Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access
290 All Other Real Property	Employment 550 Civil Rights	liei		to Justice
	446 Amer. w/Disabilities - 555 Prison Condition Other			☐ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
	440 Other Civil Rights			
O1 Original O2 R	tate Court Appellate Court	Reinstated or another Reopened (speci		
	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you a	re filing (Do not cite jurisdictions	al statutes unless diversity):	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	Brief description of cause: THE VII	-42 U.S. 2000	(e)	
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23	N DEMAND \$	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint: ☐ Yes ☐ No
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions): JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER	
DATE	SIGNATURE OF A	TORNEY OF DECORD	······································	
10/24/06	h.k	*UV1		
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY				***************************************
RECEIPT # A	MOUNT APPLYING IFP	JUDGE	MAG. JUL	OGE